IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

LUCAS ENTI	ERTAINMENT, INC.	§	
	Plaintiff,	§ §	
VS.		§ §	NO. 3-10-CV-1537-B-BD
DOES 1-185		§ §	
	Defendants.	§ §	

ORDER

Doe Defendant 114 has filed a motion to quash and a motion for protective order in connection with a Rule 45 subpoena served on his or her internet service provider. Although the court presumes that the motion is opposed, defendant has not complied with the requirements of the Standing Order on Non-Dispositive Motions. *See* STANDING ORDER, 10/15/10 at 2, ¶2 (requiring parties to hold pre-motion conference in an effort to resolve pretrial disputes without court intervention) & id. at 2-3, ¶3 (contested motion must be accompanied by joint status report explaining respective positions of the parties, supported by arguments and authorities, and signed by all attorneys and unrepresented parties who participated in the pre-motion conference).

Accordingly, Doe Defendant 114's motion to quash [Doc. #28] and motion for protective order [Doc. #29] are stricken from the record of this case. The clerk is directed to note on the docket that these documents have been unfiled.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: November 30, 2010.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

MULLILLIN

¹ The motion does not contain a certificate of conference as required by Local Rule 7.1(a) & (b).